UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,271	03/23/2004	Scott Papineau	1828A	5081

28005   7590   10/17/2008
SPRINT
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY
KSOPHT0101-Z2100
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER
WU, QING YUAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/808,271	PAPINEAU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Qing-Yuan Wu	2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 June 2008*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9,10,12-19,21-23 and 25-34* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7, 9-10, 12-19, 21-23 and 25-34* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 March 2004 and 19 June 2008* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-19, 21-23 and 25-34 are currently pending in the application.

Specification

2.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other

form of browser-executable code [pg. 13, line 11; pg. 14, line 13]. Applicant is required to delete

the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claims 14, 21 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

        a.   As to claims 14, 21 and 27, it is uncertain as to whether these claims are

dependent or independent claims. It appears that Applicants intended to claim inventions that

are of one statutory class which further depends on claim inventions of another statutory class.

For examination purposes, Claims 14, 21, and 27 are treated as <u>independent claims</u> that recites

the same limitation as their corresponding claims 13, 19 and 25.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-19, 21-23 and 25-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being

unpatentable over Papineau (Papineau, Scott, "Sprint PCS J2ME Application Environment".

Sprint PCS 3G Early Access Conference, February 6, 2002), cited by Applicant on information

disclosure statement dated 22 June 2007.

7.   As to Claim 1, Papineau teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a

computer readable medium having stored therein an object-oriented application program

interface including a plurality of object-oriented object classes to allow input and output data to

be communicated between applications, the computer readable medium comprising:

        a) a first object-oriented object class for accepting input data on a Java MIDlet in a

MIDlet Suite from an application management system on a mobile information device when the

MIDlet is invoked on the mobile information device, wherein the input data is generated by

another MIDlet in another MIDlet Suite [pgs. 27, 32 and 37, The "Muglet Class" allows context

information to be passed from the class calling the Muglet to the MIDlet being called, thereby

meeting the claim limitation]; and

  b) second object-oriented object class for setting output data from a MIDlet in a MIDlet

Suite when the MIDlet is terminated on a mobile information device, wherein the output data is

available to an application management system on the mobile information device and can be

used by other applications [pg. 28, The "Application Management System (AMS)" passes

context information to the MIDlet via the Muglet, thereby meeting the claim limitation].

8.   Papineau does not specifically teach input data generated by a non-MIDlet application on

the mobile information device. However, Papineau disclosed passing context into a MIDlet

using a Muglet class [pgs. 27-28]. Given that MIDlet interaction is limited to MIDlets packaged

together in the same MIDlet Suite, namely MIDlets are incapable of interacting with MIDlets

outside of the same MIDlet Suite and non-MIDlet applications as disclosed in applicant's

background of invention [Specification, pg. 5, line 16-pg. 6, line 7], a person of ordinary skill in

the art knowing the communication restriction of MIDlets upon reading Papineau would have

applied Papineau's passing of context into a MIDlet using a Muglet class to address either

context generated by MIDlets from a different MIDlet Suite or a non-MIDlet application, in

which subsequent implementation to address one of the two deficiency in current J2ME MIDlets

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

9.   As to Claim 2, Papineau teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein

the first object oriented object is a Muglet object class [pg. 32].

10.   As to Claim 3, Papineau teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein

the Muglet object class includes at least one of a getMediaType(), getContentType(),

getMuglet(), getReferringURI() and getURI() object-oriented classes [pgs. 32 and 34-35].

11.   As to Claim 4, Papineau teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein

the second object-oriented class is a System object class [pgs. 28-29, The "Class System" used

by the AMS meets this claim limitation].

12.   As to Claim 5, Papineau teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein

the System object class includes a setExitURI() object-oriented method [pgs. 27-28 and 30].

13.   As to Claim 6, Papineau teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein

input data accepted by the first object-oriented object class and the output data set by the second

object-oriented class includes a Uniform Resource Indicator (URI) scheme or an Internet media

type [pgs. 30 and 34, The "setCallbackURI()" method for the Class System and the "getURI()"

method of Class Muglet meets this claim limitation].

14.   As to Claim 7, Papineau teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein

the output data set by the second object-oriented object class allows execution control to be

returned to a previous context being used before the MIDlet was invoked [pg. 35, The

"setExitURI()" function allows execution control to return to the calling MIDlet].

15.   As to Claim 9, Papineau does not specifically teach the output data can be used by other

non-MIDlet applications on the mobile information device. However, Papineau disclosed the

AMS processes context information passed out from a MIDlet to whatever application was set by

the call to the "Exit URI" functionality of the System class [pg. 28]. Given that MIDlet

interaction is limited to MIDlets packaged together in the same MIDlet Suite, namely MIDlets

are incapable of interacting with MIDlets outside of the same MIDlet Suite and non-MIDlet

applications as disclosed in applicant's background of invention [Specification, pg. 5, line 16-pg.

6, line 7], a person of ordinary skill in the art knowing the communication restriction of MIDlets

upon reading Papineau would have applied Papineau's passing of context into and out of a

MIDlet using object-oriented classes to address either context generated by MIDlets from a

different MIDlet Suite or a non-MIDlet application, in which subsequent implementation to

address one of the two deficiency in current J2ME MIDlets would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art.

16.   As to Claim 10, Papineau teaches the invention substantially as claimed including

wherein the output data can be used by other MIDlets in other MIDlet suites on the mobile

information device [pgs. 28 and 37, The "Generic Connection Framework" using the

"StreamConnection" allows the MIDlets to share information between MIDlet Suites].

17.   As to Claim 12, Papineau teaches the invention substantially as claimed including

wherein the mobile information device includes a mobile phone, personal digital assistant, or a

two way pager [pgs. 4-7].

18.   As to Claim 13, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1 and 9 above. In

addition, Papineau teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method of

exchanging output data between applications on a mobile information device, the method

comprising:

        executing a MIDlet on a mobile information device [pg. 32, The "getMuglet()" method of

the Muglet Class, called to check for input data],

        wherein the MIDlet has an object-oriented method in an object-oriented object class

available for setting output data from the MIDlet [pg. 34]; and

        before the MIDlet is terminated on the mobile information device, using the object-

oriented method in the object-oriented class to set output data from the MIDlet [pgs. 28 and 30,

The processed information is passed out using the "exitURI" in the System class].

19.   As to Claim 14, Papineau teaches substantially the method for exchanging output data

between applications, therefore Papineau teaches substantially the computer readable medium

having stored instructions for implementing the method.

20.   As to Claim 15, this claim is rejected for the same reasoning as provided for Claim 5.

21.   As to Claim 16, this claim is rejected for the same reasoning as provided for Claim 12.

22.   As to Claim 17, this claim is rejected for the same reasoning as provided for Claim 6.

23.   As to Claim 18, this claim is rejected for the same reasoning as provided for Claim 7.

24.   As to Claim 34, Papineau teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein the MIDlet is packaged within a MIDlet suite [pg. 37].

25.   As to Claim 19, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1 and 3 above. In addition, Papineau teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for exchanging input data between applications on a mobile information device, the method comprising:

invoking a MIDlet from an application management system on a mobile information device [pg. 32, The "getMuglet()" method of the Muglet Class is called to check for input data];

the MIDlet using one or more object-oriented methods in the object-oriented class to accept from the application management system the input data [pgs. 4, 28 and 33-34, The "Application Management System" (AMS) uses methods of a Muglet class to pass data into the called MIDlet].

26.   As to Claim 21, Papineau teaches substantially the method for exchanging input data

between applications, therefore Papineau teaches substantially the computer readable medium

having stored instructions for implementing the method.

27.   As to Claim 22, this claim is rejected for the same reasoning as provided for Claim 3.

28.   As to Claim 23, this claim is rejected for the same reasoning as provided for Claim 6.

29.   As to Claim 25, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above. In addition,

Papineau teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for invoking an

application as an application handler on a mobile information device, the method comprising:

        invoking a MIDlet from an application management system on the mobile information

device as a Muglet that acts as a MIDlet handler [pgs. 28, 32 and 35, MIDlet was called as a

Muglet];

        wherein the Muglet includes a plurality of object-oriented methods in an object-oriented

object class available for using input data [pg. 34, The Muglet has several methods used in

processing content];

        calling an object-oriented method in the object-oriented object class from the MIDlet

handler to determine what type of input data will be processed by the MIDlet handler, wherein

the object-oriented method returns a return value [pg. 35, The "getMediaType()" function

determines the type of the media to process]; and

processing the input data based on the return value by calling one or more other object-oriented methods in the object-oriented object class [p. 37, "Connection Streams" are used after open the media to read and write to the media].

30.   As to Claim 26, Papineau teaches the invention substantially as claimed including invoking another MIDlet from the MIDlet handler using the processed input data [pg. 28, The processed information is passed out using the "exitURI" in the System class].

31.   As to Claim 27, Papineau teaches substantially the method for invoking an application as an application handler on a mobile information device, therefore Papineau teaches substantially the computer readable medium having stored instructions for implementing the method.

32.   As to Claim 28, this claim is rejected for the same reasoning as provided for Claim 6.

33.   As to Claims 29-30, these claims are rejected for the same reasoning as provided for Claim 3.

34.   As to Claim 31, Papineau teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein the MIDlet handler is a URI scheme or Internet media type handler [pg. 35, The Muglet determines what media type it is designated to handle and processes the information accordingly].

35.   As to Claim 32, this claim is rejected for the same reasoning as provided for Claims 1 and

9.

36.   As to Claim 33, this claim is rejected for the same reasoning as provided for Claim 6.

Response to Arguments

37.   Applicant's arguments filed 6/19/08 have been fully considered but they are moot in view

of the new ground of rejection.

38.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Qing-Yuan Wu whose telephone number is (571)272-3776. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-6:00pm Monday-Thursday and alternate Friday.

       If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Meng Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

       Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Meng-Ai An/   /Qing-Yuan Wu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195   Examiner, Art Unit 2194